

**REMARKS**

The Examiner objected to the abstract. In response, Applicants have replaced the abstract with a new abstract.

The Examiner rejected claims 27, 30-32 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Reimann (U.S. Patent 4,663,497).

The Examiner rejected claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Curcio et al. (U.S. Patent 6,504,111).

The Examiner rejected claims 36, 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lloyd (U.S. Patent 3,601,523).

The Examiner rejected claims 21-24 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lloyd ('523) in view of Watanabe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,319,159).

The Examiner rejected claims 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reimann ('497) in view of Lloyd ('523).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102 and §103 rejections with the following arguments.

**35 U.S.C. §102: Claims 27, 30-32, and 35**

The Examiner rejected claims 27, 30-32, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Reimann (U.S. Patent 4,663,497).

In light of the amendment of claim 27, Applicants respectfully contend that the Examiner's basis for rejecting claim 37 is moot. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully contend that Reimann does not anticipate claim 27, because Reimann does not teach each and every feature of claim 27. For example, claim 27 does not teach "wherein the lower portion of the conductive element comprises a conductive material, and wherein the upper portion of the conductive element comprises the conductive material".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Reimann does not anticipate claim 27, and that claim 27 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 30-32 and 35 depend from claim 27, Applicants contend that claims 30-32 and 35 are likewise in condition for allowance.

**35 U.S.C. §102: Claim 37**

The Examiner rejected claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Curcio et al. (U.S. Patent 6,504,111).

Applicants respectfully contend that Curcio does not anticipate claim 37, because Curcio does not teach each and every feature of claim 37. For example, claim 37 does not teach “wherein the bonding layer comprises conductive metal filled epoxy”.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Curcio does not anticipate claim 37, and that claim 37 is in condition for allowance.

**35 U.S.C. §102: Claims 36 and 38-40**

The Examiner rejected claims 36 and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Lloyd (U.S. Patent 3,601,523).

Since claim 40 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 40 is moot.

With respect to claim 36, Applicants respectfully contend that Lloyd does not anticipate claim 36, because Lloyd does not teach each and every feature of claim 36. For example, claim 36 does not

teach "applying a compressive pressure to the portion of the at least one end of the conductive element, wherein the compressive pressure applied to the portion of the at least one end of the conductive element forms a contact pad extending beyond a surface of the laminate".

The Examiner argues that Lloyd discloses: "applying a compressive pressure to the at least one end of the conductive element (column 3, lines 20-24) whereby the compressive pressure applied to the portion of the at least one end of the conductive element (15) forms a contact pad (35, 37, column 3, lines 37-38) extending beyond a surface of the laminate (10)".

In response, Applicants contend that the portion of the at least one end of the conductive element 15 that extends beyond the surface of the laminate 10, to which the compressive pressure is applied as shown in Fig. 2 of Lloyd, is removed (as shown in Fig. 3 of Lloyd) before the alleged contact pad (35, 37) is formed. Therefore, the compressive pressure disclosed in Lloyd does not form the alleged contact pad (35, 37), as required in claim 36.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Lloyd does not anticipate claim 36, and that claim 36 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 38, Applicants respectfully contend that Lloyd does not anticipate claim 38, because Lloyd does not teach each and every feature of claim 38. For example, claim 38 does not teach “impacting the surface of the laminate by the conductive element, wherein said impacting forms a hole in the laminate such that the entire conductive element provided in the providing step becomes embedded within the hole”. In Lloyd, the hole in the laminate 10 is not formed by the alleged impacting. In addition, the entire conductive element 15 provided prior to the projecting and impacting steps does not become embedded in the hole, since a portion of the conductive element 15 is removed as shown in Fig. 3 of Lloyd.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Lloyd does not anticipate claim 38, and that claim 38 is in condition for allowance. Since claim 39 depends from claim 38, Applicants contend that claim 39 is likewise in condition for allowance.

**35 U.S.C. §103: Claims 21-24 and 33-34**

The Examiner rejected claims 21-24 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lloyd ('523) in view of Watanabe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,319,159).

Since claims 33-34 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 33-34 is moot.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 21 is not unpatentable over Lloyd in view of Watanabe, because Lloyd in view of Watanabe does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 21. For example, Lloyd in view of Watanabe does not teach or suggest "applying a compressive pressure to the portion of the at least one end of the conductive element, wherein the compressive pressure applied to the portion of the at least one end of the conductive element forms a contact pad extending beyond the surface of the laminate".

The Examiner argues that Lloyd discloses: "applying a compressive pressure to the at least one end of the conductive element (column 3, lines 20-24) whereby the compressive pressure applied to the portion of the at least one end of the conductive element (15) forms a contact pad (35, 37, column 3, lines 37-38) extending beyond a surface of the laminate (10)".

In response, Applicants contend that the portion of the at least one end of the conductive element 15 that extends beyond the surface of the laminate 10, to which the compressive pressure is applied as shown in Fig. 2 of Lloyd, is removed (as shown in Fig. 3 of Lloyd) before the alleged contact pad (35, 37) is formed. Therefore, the compressive pressure disclosed in Lloyd does not form the alleged contact pad (35, 37), as required in claim 21.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 21 is not unpatentable over Lloyd in view of Watanabe, and that claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Since

claims 22-24 depend from claim 21, Applicants contend that claims 22-24 are likewise in condition for allowance.

**35 U.S.C. §103: Claims 28-29**

The Examiner rejected claims 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reimann (497) in view of Lloyd (523).

The Examiner rejected claims 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Reimann ('497) in view of Lloyd ('523). Since claims 28-29 depend from claim 27, which Applicants have argued *supra* to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102, Applicants maintain that claims 28-29 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).



**CONCLUSION**

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 10/23/2003

Jack P. Friedman  
Jack P. Friedman  
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olson & Watts  
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201  
Latham, New York 12110  
(518) 220-1850

FAX RECEIVED

OCT 31 2003

TECHNICAL SERVICES